

Y/W



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/633,463	08/07/2000	Stephen J. Orr	0100.0001080	3449
23418	7590	04/05/2005	EXAMINER	
VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ 222 N. LASALLE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60601			NATNAEL, PAULOS M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/633,463	Applicant(s) ORR ET AL.	
	Examiner Paulos M. Natnael	Art Unit 2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 14-16 and 19-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 13, 17 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims **1-3, 8-10 and 19-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee, U.S. Pat. No. 6,507,366.

Considering claim 1, Lee discloses all claimed subject matter, note;

a) the claimed method of “beginning a zoom mode”, is met by “initialization of Zoom” step 320, 3A.

b) identifying a first portion of an image, is met by “detect initial image frame”, step 330, FIG.3A;

c) displaying the first portion, and displaying the second portion, is met by fig.5 which shows position of the object on the screen.

d) detecting motion of an object within the portion of the image, is met by “Is Motion vector detected” step 350, fig.3A;

e) selecting a second portion of the image such that the object appears at least a predetermined distance from an edge of the second portion of the image, is met by "detect subsequent image frame" step 340 and 360 "tracking object", Fig.3A;

f) displaying the second portion, is met by fig.5 which shows position of the object on the screen, when the camera is performing a zooming operation.

Considering claim 2, the claimed when at least one edge of the second portion to the image extends beyond the image, terminating the zoom mode, is met by the disclosure in col. 7, lines 1-6 wherein, if it is judged that no more zooming can be performed while the object is not included in the effective region (to be described below), the zoom/focus controller 6 recognizes that the object is beyond the tracking range of the zooming operation, and controls the process to return to step 310 of the initial state (step 371c)."

Considering claim 3, a method for providing a zoom video tracking image, comprising the step of, measuring a difference between the first portion of the image and the second portion of the image; and when the difference between the first portion of the image and the second portion of the image exceeds a predetermined threshold, terminating the zoom mode;

Regarding claim 3, see rejection of claim 2;

Considering claim **8**, see rejection of claim 1;

Considering claim **9**, see rejection of claim 2;

Regarding claim **10**, see rejection of claim 2;

Regarding claim **19**, see rejection of claim 1(e);

Considering claim **20**, wherein the object is a single object within the portion of the image, is met by the operation of tracking object 360, fig.3A.

Considering claim **21**, see rejection of claim 1.

Considering claim **22**, see rejection of claim 1.

Considering claim **23**, the claimed adjusting at least one of a horizontal position and a vertical position of the zoom image relative to the full frame, is met by Fig.5;

Considering claim **24**, wherein motion is detected for a single object within the zoom image;

Regarding claim 24, see rejection of claim 1(d).

Considering claim 25, the claimed including adjusting a ratio of a zoom area included within the zoom image and a full frame area included within the full frame, is met by Figs. 4 and 5;

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4,11, are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,923,365.

Considering claim 4, the method of claim 1, wherein the first portion of the image and the second portion of the image are MPEG2 images; and wherein the step of detecting motion of an object within the portion of the image includes a step of examining MPEG2 motion vectors;

Regarding claim 4, Lee discloses the method and apparatus for automatically tracking a moving object. Lee also discloses detecting motion vectors. Lee does not specifically disclose an MPEG image. However, MPEG as a video standard is well known in the television art, therefore, it would have been obvious to the skilled in the art

Art Unit: 2614

at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Lee, in order to effectively utilize the MPEG standard, making the system of Lee more versatile and useful.

Considering claim 11, see rejection of claim 4;

5. Claims **5-7 and 14-16** are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamir et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,923,365 in view of Lee, U.S. Pat. No. 6,507,366.

Considering claim 5, Tamir discloses the following claimed subject matter, note;

b) a video signal processor ... operative to select a portion of the video image to provide a selected portion of the video image is met by Host computer 30 and the image analyzer 50 (FIG.1);

c) the video signal processor ... is met by Host computer 30 and the image analyzer 50 (FIG.1); (see col. 8, lines 53-54)

Except for;

a) the claimed tuner operative to receive a video image;

d) while all edges of the selected portion of the video image are within the video image to zoom to the selected portion of the video image, to detect movement of an object within the selected portion of the video image, and to select a second portion of the video image to redefine the selected portion of the video image

Regarding a), Tamir et al. do not disclose a tuner. However, the Examiner takes an Official Notice here in that a tuner is a very well known device in the art of Radio and television electronics and, since Tamir et al. clearly suggest the use of a tuner (see col. 6, lines 59-65) it would have been obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Tamir et al. by providing a tuner to tune to a desired frequency or channel.

Regarding d), Tamir et al does not specifically and entirely disclose the limitation claimed in claim 5 (d). However, Tamir et al. discloses, "The tracking procedure takes into account the fact that there may be a change of magnification (zoom in and out) and of objects' poses through the succession of frames." (col. 10, lines 10-13) Besides, the zoom mode is well known in the art, and in fact Tamir discloses zooming at the images F1, F2, and F3 in Fig.4. For, without zooming or picking this image out of the entire field or court as shown in Fig.2, the system would not be able to process the desired image.

Lee clearly indicates the initialization or the beginning or the start (whatever word one wants to use) of the zoom process in Figs. 1 and 3A. After zooming on a desired portion of the image, Lee detect initial image frame, subsequent image frame, motion vector, and tracks the object in question, etc.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Tamir by providing it with a zooming mode or initialization of Zoom at the beginning of the process, in order to focus on the desired portion of the image for reliable and efficient processing, because without specifically focusing or zooming on the desired portion of the image, the process would not be completely effective or would not even work properly.

Considering claim 6, wherein the video signal processor is further operative to determine a difference between the first portion of the video image and the second portion of the video image, and to cancel zoom in response to the difference exceeding a predetermined threshold.

Regarding claim 6, Tamir does not specifically disclose canceling zoom, although Tamir suggests a zoom mode would be utilized as illustrated in Fig.4, because without zooming on the desired image the processing would not be effectively performed.

Lee discloses that if it is judged that no more zooming can be performed while the object is not included in the effective region (to be described below), the zoom/focus controller 6 recognizes that the object is beyond the tracking range of the zooming operation, and controls the process to return to step 310 of the initial state (step 371c)." (col. 7, lines 1-6)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Tamir by calculating the difference between the two portion and recognizing that the object is beyond tracking range and thus

terminating the zoom and return to the initialization step, thus giving the system of Tamir an simple, yet effective control of the zoom process.

Considering claim 7, the claimed television system of claim 5, wherein the television system is one of set top box, a desk top box, and a personal digital assistant, is met by Fig.1;

Regarding claim 14, see rejection of claim 5;

As to claim 15, see rejection of claim 6.

Considering claim 16, the claimed wherein the first portion of the image and the second portion of the image are MPEG2 images; and wherein the step of detecting motion of an object within the portion of the image includes a step of examining MPEG2 motion vectors, is met by the disclosure that "The optibase JPG-2000 board is using Motion JPEG algorithm for compression; other algorithm, such as MPEG, may also be used."
(see col. 6, lines 56-58)

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that Lee describes identifying a first portion of an image, however step 330 describes detect initial image frame rather than "identifying a first portion of an image." Apparently, the applicant is arguing that while Lee identifies a first frame the instant application operates on a portion or part of an image and not a full frame. First of all, the claims do not recite "a portion of an image, i.e. not a full frame". The claims recite "identifying a first portion of an image." Secondly, it appears from this angle of argument that the applicants are arguing contrary to their own specification. On page 7 of the specification the applicant has defined a full frame as "merely a single frame of a sequence of frames that collectively comprise the digitized video data 36." As is well known in the art, a frame may be considered an image or a portion of an image depending on a given definition. Typical television prior art defines a frame as two fields (odd and even field); and in the MPEG system an image may be a frame or several frames, the difference being time here. That is to say, frame 1 is displayed or processed in a given time, frame 2 in a second given time interval, etc. The applicant's disclosure clearly illustrates that. If applicants then are going to argue that a portion of an image is not a frame, then the specification and/or claims have disclosure issue that must be addressed. Hence, if as defined in the instant specification "a full frame is a single frame of a sequence of frames" which nevertheless appears to be a misnomer, then it follows logically that the reference of Lee detecting initial image frame (step 330) meets the claimed limitation as claimed. (Initialization of zoom meets the claimed entering a zoom mode). To overcome this reasonably broad interpretation of the claims, applicants

may want to amend the claims to recite "identifying a first portion of an image which is not a full frame" or to a language similar to that, since Lee detects the first frame of the image, i.e., given the above interpretation, a portion of the entire image. The argument therefore is unpersuasive.

Applicant further argues that the step of "Is motion vector detected?" (step 350) is not the same as "detecting motion of an object within the portion of the image". It is clear from the disclosure that the system of Lee first detects if there is motion. If so, then the system tracks the motion of the object (360). As to whether it is within the portion of the image, examiner wished to point the applicant to the previous response above.

The arguments regarding the dependent claims presuppose that the Lee reference does not disclose claim 1. However, as shown above the reference of Lee has adequate disclosure and claims 1 and its dependents (except those objected to having allowable subject matter) are rejected. Argument therefore is unpersuasive.

The applicant also argued against the taking of official notice by the examiner. The applicant argues that "the system described by Tamir, rather than using a tuner, would likely receive a signal directly from a camera or video player as part of a sports analysis system and as such would not need the use of a tuner. (Tamir, col. 6, lines 59 through 65). Examiner submits that the system of Tamir discloses in the same passage that the Applicant quoted that the "the video encoder/decoder receives the video input from a plurality of optional sources such as ...VC, ... VD or **broadcasted transmission** and

Art Unit: 2614

also outputs live video." [emphasis added by examiner] Tamir col. 6, lines 59-65. As is well known in the art **broadcasted transmission** requires or needs a tuner to tune to the desired frequency or desired channel. Therefore, applicant's argument is unpersuasive because the reference used (Tamir in this case) suggests the use of such a tuner and hence the Office Action has, contrary to Applicant's allegation, established *prima facie* of obviousness.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims **12, 13, 17 and 18** are again objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art fails to disclose a method of providing zoom video tracking image, wherein, during panning of the image, objects within the image have larger MPEG2 motion vectors than an MPEG2 motion vector of the object within the first portion of the image, and wherein in the step of examining MPEG2 motion vectors, a compensated MPEG2 motion vector for objects in the first portion of the image is determined by eliminating an MPEG2 motion vector of the entire portion of the image taken as a whole from the MPEG2 motion vector of the object in the first portion of the image, as in claim **12**; wherein, during panning of the image, objects within the image have larger MPEG2 motion vectors than an MPEG2 motion vector of the object within the first portion of the

image, and wherein the step of examining MPEG2 motion vectors comprises determining that an object has a larger motion vector in one direction when observed in a full frame of the image, and has a smaller motion vector when observed in a zoom frame in order to identify panning of the image, as in claim 13; wherein, during panning of the image, objects within the image have larger MPEG2 motion vectors than an MPEG2 motion vector of the object within the first portion of the image, and wherein video signal processor is further operative to determine a compensated MPEG2 motion vector for objects in the first portion of the image by eliminating an MPEG2 motion vector of the entire portion of the image taken as a whole from the MPEG2 motion vector of the object in the first portion of the image, as in claims 17; wherein, during panning of the image, objects within the image have larger MPEG2 motion vectors than an MPEG2 motion vector of the object within the first portion of the image, and wherein video signal processor is further operative to determine that an object has a larger motion vector in one direction when observed in a full frame of the image, and has a smaller motion vector when observed in a zoom frame in order to identify panning of the image, as in claim 18;

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paulos M. Natnael whose telephone number is (703) 305-0019. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (703) 305-4795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



PAULOS M. NATNAEL
PATENT EXAMINER

PMN
March 29, 2005